

REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 5, 2008. Applicant respectfully request consideration of the response in light of the following remarks. Claims 1-13 remain pending in the application.

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,819,443 (hereinafter Shima) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,019 (hereinafter Shiohara).

Traversal of Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-13 as being unpatentable over Shima in view of Shiohara.

Applicant believes that Shima and Shiohara are not seen to teach the following features of independent claim 1. Specifically, Shima and Shiohara is not seen to describe at least the features of “an input unit for inputting a print instruction for printing configuration information of the network interface device according to a user operation” and “generating print data representing the configuration information of the network interface device based on the configuration information transmitted from the transmitting unit” as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action acknowledges that Shima does not teach the acquiring information being configuration information of the network interface device (Office Action, Page 3), but is taught by Shiohara. Shiohara is seen to describe that the printer 11 transmits module configuration information in response to a request from the print data generation system 1 and the print data generation system 1 generates print data based on the module configuration information transmitted from the printer 11. However, the print data generated by the print data generation system 1 does not represent the configuration information of the

network interface device (i.e. the module configuration information in Shiohara). More specifically, Shiohara is directed to calling the required execution modules by interpreting the module configuration information, and generating print data by the printer driver comprising the called execution module, as described in column 7, line 6 – column 9, line 33. The module configuration information of Shiohara is used not for generating the print data representing the configuration information of the network interface device itself, but for calling the execution modules to be comprised in the print driver.

Secondly, Shima and Shiohara fail to teach inputting a print instruction for printing the configuration information of the network interface device according to a user operation because Shima and Shiohara are not directed to generating the print data representing the configuration information of the network interface device itself.

The present invention discloses transmitting configuration information of a network interface device to an information processing device when a print instruction for printing the configuration information of the network interface device is input, and generating print data representing the configuration information of the network interface device by a generating unit arranged in the information processing device. Because of this, the present invention can achieve an effect that the configuration information can be printed even if a print control device does not have a function for generating the print data representing the configuration information of the network interface device because the information processing device is capable of generating the print data representing the configuration information of the network interface device.

Applicant believes that Shima and Shiohara, either alone or in combination, are not seen to describe all of the features of independent claim 1. It is therefore believed that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Independent claims 5, 8, 9, 10, and 12 also include substantially similar features as that of claim 1, and are rejected based on the same reasons as claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 5, 8, 9, 10, and 12 are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim

1. The other pending claims each depend from an allowable base claim and are believed to be in condition for allowance as well. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 103(a) rejection be withdrawn and the claims indicated as allowable at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

02/05/2009

/Jason Truong/

Date

Jason Truong, Reg. No. 53,704
Patent Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731
Telephone: (949) 932-3329
Fax: (949) 932-3560